


No. 60 January 1973

Spearhead

10p



**EUROPE:
THE
FIGHT
TO GET
OUT
BEGINS**

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Liberals Cash In

Television and the press have been unanimous in describing the Liberal victory at Sutton and the high vote for the National Front at Uxbridge as the outstanding features of December's two by-elections. The Uxbridge result has been dealt with elsewhere in this issue. What of the so-called Liberal 'triumph'?

Probably not one voter in 100 at Sutton really understood, let alone supported, what the Liberals stood for as a party. The views of just a few people who voted for the Liberal candidate and who subsequently gave their reasons to the *Evening Standard* are instructive. Said one housewife, "I have been a Conservative all my life. But they have let us down on a local bridge project. I hope the Liberals can save the last remaining part of the area."

Then an immigrant male nurse: "It will


take time for Mr. Tope (the newly elected Liberal member) to implement changes in the traffic system. I only hope he can do it."

Said a pensioner, "I'm sure the Liberals can achieve at least one thing, and that is to lighten the burden of travelling costs for pensioners."

And a student: "I am sure he (Tope) can do a great deal to improve the lack of local entertainment."

Some answers were even more revealing. A young insurance broker just said, "It's time for a change. Any area which has been the stronghold of any party for so long can only benefit from something new."

But perhaps the choicest answer of all came from a film director: "It was getting to a stage where I was no longer proud to be British. We have been steamrollered into so many issues without any chance of an opinion that any change must be good for the country."



None of these answers suggest a clue of what Liberalism is really about. They range from a concern with local problems and personal problems to nothing more than a desperate feeling that any change is better than none. As for the last one quoted, this seems to suggest what many voters feel inwardly — a frustrated patriotism and a resentment that governments have forced through policies

which the people, were they consulted, would oppose — immigration and the Common Market perhaps? The very idea that that gentleman is going to be satisfied by Liberalism is, to say the least, pathetic.

The fact is that this Liberal honeymoon — for that is all it is — demonstrates nothing so much as a deep vacuum in British political life which a party of quacks, conmen, pansies, Maoists, Trotskyists, Britain-haters, racial masochists and plain public nuisances is able temporarily to fill while no alternative is to hand. As readers of this magazine will know, an alternative is on the way. It appeared at Uxbridge, and without the intervention of three fringe candidates would certainly have beaten the Liberals into fourth place.

Odious Comparison

Sometimes articles or comment in a leading newspaper, rather than action or events in the highest realm of national affairs, provide the most significant news of the moment. So with Northern Ireland in the last month.

More revealing than anything that has actually happened in the Northern Irish sphere was the *Evening News* Editorial on December 21st, which said:

"... There is not much to choose between Sean MacStiofain and the IRA and William Craig and the Vanguard movement. On either side they arouse the passions that lead to violence..."

If anything was needed to illustrate the utter sickness of mind that prevails in the 'influential' circles of Britain today, this comment provided it amply. By what conceivable stretch of imagination can the campaign of the Provisional IRA, with its mutilation by bombings of innocent women, children and old folk, be likened to that of Vanguard and its leaders, which at its most extreme has consisted of a few injudicious political statements and — possibly — physical action against selected opponents?

So far the Vanguard/UDA movement has been concerned mostly with the mobilisation of the Loyalist Majority in Northern Ireland in self-defence against terror — made necessary by the weak-kneed policy of the Westminster Government towards that same terror. So far as words are concerned, its main crime to date seems to be to have made it clear to Westminster that it will resist, if necessary by force, any move to betray the Loyalist Majority to the Irish Republic. To anyone who has troubled to read the recent Government 'Green Paper' on Northern Ireland it must be quite clear that this latter possibility is far from being remote. Such unequivocal warnings are therefore by no means out of place.

Seen in this context, comparisons with the IRA are utterly odious. However, just supposing that it was possible to make a case for the language and actions of Craig

SPEARHEAD

No. 60 JANUARY 1973

Office: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CR0 2QF, Surrey (Tel. 01-684 3730)

Editor: John Tyndall Asst. Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

and his followers being as extreme and ruthless as those of their opponents, would that itself place them in no different a bracket? Surely not. On the one side are people who, whatever one thinks of their tactics, are pro-British and determined to defend British sovereignty over a part of British territory; on the other side are people who are dedicated enemies of Britain and determined to place that part of British territory under a foreign power. That a senior British newspaper does not side axiomatically with the former is a lurid reflection of the state of mind that prevails today among the influential and the powerful. A state of mind that could perhaps explain the whole story of British abdication and surrender in the post-war world.

Vietnam: A Sell Out

The same state of mind displayed by the press over Northern Ireland may be seen in its treatment of the peace negotiations for Vietnam. Scarcely a single paper failed to express regret that the original formula agreed to by the Nixon Government through its envoy Henry Kissinger had been sabotaged at the last moment by North Vietnamese intransigence. But in fact that very formula represented an almost total surrender to the Communists.

Negotiated, as was the future of Czechoslovakia at Munich, completely over the heads of the country concerned, the agreement was to allow huge Communist forces to remain in South Vietnam at the same time as all American forces were to be withdrawn. In return for an American commitment not to provide any more arms for South Vietnam there was no commitment whatever on the part of Russia or China not to arm the North.

And — perhaps most fantastic of all — the American taxpayer was to foot the bill for the massive rebuilding programme in North Vietnam made necessary by American bombing!

As is now known, the Communists at the peace table found these terms unacceptable and a resumption of the bombing was made. How did this come about? Only those within the confidences of the supreme rulers of the world will know for certain. From our less exalted position only a guess can be made. The guess is that either the Reds have good reason to believe that even greater concessions can be extracted from 'the world's leading anti-Communist power', or the plan is that following the new spate of bombing they accept the original formula, thus giving the appearance of a moral 'victory' for America which will be acceptable to public opinion in the US.

Whatever the event, one thing can be regarded as practically certain. After the huge expenditure of life and money in yet another crusade to stop Communist aggression, once again the objects of that aggression will be realised and yet another Communist

victory will be recorded.

Something is deeply wrong in the Western world.

Hands Off Our Oil!

Our valiant ally *Candour* pointed out recently that American big business was looking to Britain's newly found North Sea oil resources to make good the dwindling reserves of the once oil-rich US. It is indeed an appalling comment on our times that such a thought should exist. American big business is not without an efficient intelligence service. It would not have entertained the idea of using British oil had it not had good grounds for thinking that the powers that be in Britain would comply.

Now another claimant for the oil has come forward. Yes — you've guessed it — the Common Market! Mr. Ferdinand Spaak, Director General of Energy in the EEC, has stated that North Sea oil should be a "Community asset" rather than a national resource of the countries directly concerned. Again one cannot quite see our present Government making much of a show of resistance to such an idea. Already there has been an abominable sell-out of North Sea oil to foreign interests which the Government has been in no way prepared to check (indeed which probably it has encouraged as part of its philosophy which believes in the greatest possible internationalisation of our economic life).

At a time when the need for national economic independence was never stronger in Britain, the discovery of North Sea oil is the greatest stroke of fortune. If we were in our right senses we would guard this asset for ourselves with all the means in our power.

Bormann Good Business

Hard on the heels of the race relations industry in Britain's biggest growth table is the Martin Bormann industry. For what one expert calculated as about the fiftieth time, a 'Martin Bormann' was reported last month as having appeared in South America. Without going very far to satisfy itself as to the truth of this report, the *Daily Express* splashed the story over its centre pages for several days. It did not make very convincing reading.

One of the world's most eminent Bormann-hunters, a certain Ladislas Farago, alleged that new facts had come to light (!!!) proving that Bormann had been in South America since shortly after the end of the war, mostly in Argentina — with the full knowledge and protection of the Peron Government and its successors. He had now been located by an agent of the Argentine police, who was pictured face to face with 'Bormann' in Mendoza. 'Bormann', so the story said, although found, had not been touched. No-one had yet tried to arrest him — not even Israeli secret agents! Nevertheless, the story that he had been seen was blared out loud and clear by one of the

world's leading newspapers — surely the best way of alerting 'Bormann' as to the danger of his position and giving him a chance to slip away.

Farago's competitors in the Bormann industry, notably Simon Wiesenthal, the arch documentary expert on ex-Nazis, do not think much of this story and have picked holes in it in much greater detail than we have space for here. Probably this 'Bormann' will go the same way as the others — into obscurity. Perhaps the real Bormann is still alive in South America — or in Outer Mongolia, Biafra, North Borneo — or Bishops Stortford. Or perhaps he really did die in Berlin at the end of the war. To the vast majority of mankind it simply doesn't matter. The war has been over 27 years. It is surely time to let sleeping dogs lie.

But of course that would be unfair to the sales of the *Daily Express*, wouldn't it!

Laissez-Faire

Production of Britten Norman's highly successful plane, the little islander, is moving from the Isle of Wight to a factory at Gosselies, Belgium. Says the Fairey Group, of which Britten Norman is a part, "This will not affect jobs on the Isle of Wight. The 180 workers there will still be employed finishing, marketing and maintaining the planes made on the Continent."

Big deal for the workers on the Isle of Wight! If, however, production too remained on the island that would mean more jobs for British workers instead of Belgians — as obviously the firm is in the process of expansion.

Here is a classic case of the need for a controlled economy — as distinct from laissez-faire. A government conscious of its duty to the workers of its own country simply would not allow such a shift of capital abroad. It would insist that expansion took place in Britain, providing employment for Britons and keeping the industry in question wholly British. Yet what the Government is allowing to happen is just what some right-wing Tories would applaud, fools that they are.

Crucial Difference?

Mrs. Gillian Goold of Southall is expelled from the Monday Club because she helped National Front candidate John Clifton against the Tories in the by-election at Uxbridge.

At the very same time as Mrs. Goold was helping Mr. Clifton, another Monday Club member, Sir Ian McTaggart, was speaking on behalf of Mr. Christopher Frere-Smith, anti-Common Market candidate at Sutton and Cheam, also against the Tories. We understand that no move to expel Sir Ian is contemplated.

What difference is there between Mrs. Goold and Sir Ian McTaggart? Apart from the fact that Sir Ian is a millionaire, none of which we are aware.

Common Market: the fight to get out begins

THE DEED HAS BEEN DONE. Heath has signed the Treaty of Rome and Britain is in the Common Market. There never really was any doubt that this would happen. Despite the claims of various pressure groups that they would sway the Government away from its course at the last moment, Heath was certain to take us in. He has on his side the powers that really count: the Tory Party machine, the majority of the mass media, the community of international big business and finance. Against him stands only the people, and today the people have no effective instrument of political power.

We have always said that the British people must first build an instrument of political power before their voice can be heard and their influence felt. There are no short cuts to this; it is going to take time. It could not be done in time to stop us being dragged into Europe.

Can it be done in time to get us out of Europe? **It can and it must.**

Getting out of the Common Market is now the foremost task that faces the British people. Notwithstanding the prominence that we have given to other issues in recent months, there is no issue now that overrides this one. The battle to get out must begin. It is a battle for Britain's freedom as real as any battle facing us in 1940. Every one of our countrymen and women who value this freedom must now give everything they have to the task of winning it back.

In this task every organisation that can wield substantial active strength in the anti-Market battle is an ally and a friend — even if on other political matters there is disagreement. The urgency of Britain's position — and the small time that there is left to salvage her independent nationhood — demands

that people forget their cherished illusions of 'respectability' and cooperate with others where cooperation will bring a real increase of strength and impact.

This magazine supports the National Front. It does so because it believes that in the long term the National Front is the only political force with the policies, the vitality and the will to save Britain.


This does not mean, however, that we do not recognise that there are other organisations, and many sincere and dedicated people, outside the NF who are equally com-

mitted to getting Britain out of Europe.

What some of the latter must learn — and learn quickly — is that any previously cherished illusions of 'respectability' matter nothing now beside the task of opposing the European sell-out with every means within their power. They and the NF must find a way to work together in activities directed against the Market — even if on other issues they cannot accept all of each other's policies. There must be a united front of all effective and substantial political groupings in the fight for national freedom.

We propose that from now on the movement to regain Britain's freedom from Europe become known as The British Resistance — that this be the name given to the fight for freedom, whatever political organisations are involved. We further propose that the symbol of this Resistance be a 'V' — for victory, reviving the symbol of resistance and defiance of Continental tyranny in the last war. Let the 'V' symbol assert itself everywhere. Let it appear on walls all over Britain. Let it appear on banners and on leaflets. Let it be the sign that pro-Market traitors dread and patriots everywhere recognise as the sign of deliverance.

The British Resistance begins this month. It already has millions of allies — in the great majority of Britons who oppose control by the Market bureaucracy. The majority can still win — if it gets off its backside and takes action now to save our country. The lead is being given by organisations like the National Front. They will never accept the Treaty of Rome. They will never cease to fight until that Treaty is torn up and Britain is once again free. Let the people follow this lead — and free again we can become!



"Well done, Ted, I knew you'd get Britain round to our way of thinking!"

Where Permissiveness leads

Reprinted with acknowledgements to Daily Telegraph Weekend Supplement.

UNLIKE ants or bees, human beings do not come into the world endowed with instincts which determine their behaviour and ensure social co-operation. A baby is a bundle of potentialities transmitted genetically, some of which will be developed while others will remain dormant or even atrophy. The behaviour even of a young child stems from a synthesis of these potential tendencies and abilities and the environment in which it has lived.

The consequence is that the young must be made to fit into the society in which they are living: not only by learning skills, but also by acquiring sentiments and habits without which this society could not continue to exist.

Every known culture, no matter how primitive, has been produced by a process of cumulation and transmission between generations stretching over millions of years, right back into pre-human stage. Human beings have become so dependent on this heritage that a new generation, if cut off from its elders, could not even go back to an ape-like existence: it would simply die off.

Few people claim that we could leave the young to rediscover the entire body of science in a few years. Recently, however, an absurd notion has gained currency that it is not necessary to teach the young how to behave because, if left alone, they will spontaneously discover what is right and what is wrong simply by following their "nature". In courses on theory of education the future teachers are told that their aim should be to develop all potentialities of their pupils, the unstated assumption being that all these potentialities are for good. (Once I asked one of the pundits who preach this doctrine what he proposed to do about the potentiality to become an expert sadist, but he evaded my question.)

NOTION OF ROUSSEAU

The notion that human nature is inherently good was formulated in the 18th century by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and it has often been used since to back certain political programmes. Now, for the first time, an entire educational system is based on it. (An interesting sidelight on the relationship between words and deeds is provided by the fact that, without the excuse of poverty, Rousseau — this upholder of goodness of mankind and prophet of modern educational theory — put all his six children into an orphanage, where they died of neglect.)

Many people also believe that Freud proved that everything would be for the best if we let everybody follow the promptings of their natures, whereas he said exactly the opposite. True, he maintained that neuroses are generated by frustration of the sexual desires, but he regarded this as a necessary price of civilisation.

Nothing that has been discovered in psychology, sociology and anthropology points to a conclusion that human nature is intrinsically good.

People may argue about what is good and bad, but if we agree that kindness, tolerance and peacefulness are good, while selfishness, brutality and exploitation are bad, it is absolutely clear that human potentialities for evil are at least as great as for good.

It follows that we cannot bring about a better society, or even maintain the minimal decencies by simply letting the young follow the promptings of their "natures".

NO GOLDEN AGE

This does not mean that the old customs, morals and manners are necessarily the best. There has never been a golden age of universal kindness and happiness; records of cruelty and exploitation are inexhaustible. Even the most sublime teachings have been used as justification for atrocious deeds. In the name of Christ, who preached love, poverty and tolerance, wicked men grabbed and hoarded gold, traded in slaves, tortured innocent people accused of disbelief, and burnt poor women labelled as witches. Similarly, in the name of an ideology which promised to put into practice the old dream of liberty, equality and fraternity, Lenin and Stalin converted their entire country into an enormous jail, the like of which the world had never seen before.

No enduring society has been recorded where there was no agreement whatsoever on what was right or wrong; but a few historical examples indicate the consequence of a complete lack of moral consensus.

During the "gold rushes", settlements sprang up which contained people of different races, nations, classes and creeds, self-selected by their greed and lack of moral scruple, who agreed on nothing except the desirability of gold. Hair-raising brutality and treachery characterised these societies without ethics. Similar phenomena have been noted during periods of great upheaval caused by wars and revolutions, when a collapse of the social order liberated many individuals from the constraints of morality and law.

Most of the sources of contemporary discontent and demoralisation have deep roots in the very nature of industrial society. It is difficult to find an answer to the alienation produced by the size and impersonality of the economic machine; or to find a defence against the isolation of the individual and breaking of the social ties by high social mobility. What defence can there be against the boredom and frustration of creative impulses, engendered by mechanised work, or against the steam-rolling of individual differences by computerised organisation?

To maintain civilised standards in the face of these difficulties will be a task which will demand all mankind's moral and intellectual resources. Unfortunately, however, these resources themselves are being eroded by the massive process of pollution of the mind.

Every human society which has endured long enough to leave records, or to be described by travellers or ethnographers, has had elaborate customs and institutions which were effective in instilling into the young the sentiments necessary for its perpetuation. Now, for the first time in recorded history, Western liberalism offers us a spectacle of a system which not only has given up the task of moral education, but actually employs vast resources and means of persuasion of unprecedented power to extirpate the customs, norms and ideals indispensable for its survival.

It would be miraculous if a social order which permits such massive anti-socialisation could fail to destroy itself.

The communist system is at least free from this crippling disability and appears destined to win, owing to its rivals' self-poisoning. Life under communism continues to be grim in many respects: but what the communist rulers do not neglect is moral education. They insist that their schools, parents, mass media and youth clubs teach the young simple civic virtues such as honesty, respect for work and a sense of duty towards the community.

If, under capitalism, the present process of anti-socialisation of the public by the mass media continues, the communist system will become not only the stronger, but also the more desirable by virtue of being alone in holding out a promise of an eventual improvement.

PRINTING SERVICES

Printing services are available to Nationalists at very reasonable rates. For estimates write to Box 1933, Spearhead, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO. 2QF, Surrey.

REGULAR readers of *Spearhead* will know that the threads which hold together the infinitely complex web of Communist subversion in Britain do not all lead directly to the Head Office of the Communist Party of Great Britain in King Street, London, or to the Soviet Embassy. Indeed, it may be said that the activities of overt Communist groups are the least of the problems which confront those who wish to root out subversion.

In our last issue Richard Lawson drew attention to the existence of a crypto-Communist student organisation called the Student Christian Movement, whose nominal Head Office is to be found at an address in London, N.W.11, and to some of its activities. This group has a two-fold purpose: to inculcate students who believe themselves to be Christians with a rationale which will allow them to involve themselves with the revolutionary activities of Godless Communist revolutionaries at home and abroad; and to train selected adepts of the Communist-Christian cult to further the cause of political, social and moral disintegration in educational establishments — particularly teacher-training colleges in Britain and in universities and colleges (for White students) in southern Africa.

The reason for this approach is obvious. In the same way that the Communist Party has long since given up hope of a traditional violent revolution in Britain, and has thus for many years concentrated on communising Britain by subverting the upper echelons of society, a similar decision has been made concerning the means to destroy South Africa.

YOUTH SUBVERTED

As a result of the series of arrests which followed the Rivonia trial in South Africa some years ago, and the total inability of the various Black nations in South Africa to bind themselves together into an effective revolutionary force, the Communists have decided that they must direct their attentions to the leading elements of White society there — particularly to the younger generation.

If the next generation of political leaders, educationalists, journalists, administrators and the like can be persuaded to hold in contempt White civilisation, White culture, White achievements, White standards, and embrace instead the muzzy sloppy values of crypto-Marxist "liberalism" and multi-racialism, then the communist cause in that country would be far advanced. The progress of subversion in South Africa should be of immediate concern to patriotic Britons, for if South Africa falls, then a whole series of nails will be driven into the coffin of non-communist European civilisation everywhere.

There are, of course, numerous "Christian" bodies devoted to undermining South Africa, and they all liaise with one another to a greater or lesser degree. The activities of the Student Christian Movement against

MARTIN WEBSTER

UNTANGLE THIS WEB OF RED SUBVERSION!

South Africa are co-ordinated by its Europe-Africa Project, under the control of an African Communist Mr. Chenhamo Chimutengwende ("Chen"). "Chen's" base of operations is a basement office at 101-103 Gower Street, London W.C.1, in convenient spitting distance from the London School of Economics, where the S.C.M. has an extremely active Branch. "Chen" is editor of a bi-monthly 16 page newspaper called *Liberation Struggle* which gives rabid support to Communist dictatorships in the 'Third World', particularly in Africa, and support for all Black Communist anti-White terrorist organisations, particularly those operating in Africa. "Chen" is also chief officer of the Centre for Writers and Journalists from the Exploited Third World (CWJ). Both *Liberation Struggle* and the CWJ operate from the same address in Gower Street as the S.C.M. Europe-Africa project. Gower Street is also the venue for all other S.C.M. meetings in London.

The long-term objective of the S.C.M. Europe-Africa project is to select from the S.C.M. student membership well indoctrinated communist-Christians (particularly those who have "proved" themselves by a liberal attitude to drug use and multi-racial sexual relations) who have a desire to engage in post graduate work. It is intended that such students will be found — through the liberal-Left academic network — post graduate places in Universities in South Africa, where they will be well placed to spread the poison of Marxist-Christian permissiveness among the undergraduate student body.

DRUGS AND RIOTS

It would seem that this project is already well under way and having some effect on the student population of South Africa. The student riots in Cape Town earlier this year (centred around the Anglican cathedral of that city) is one indication. Another was the arrest of one of Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith's sons for drug possession on his return from a South African university. Certainly the arrest of the Anglican Dean of Cape Town Gonville Ffrench-Beytagh, and his subsequent deportation for pro-Communist activities was just the tip of the Christian-Communist iceberg.

It is a fact that the South African security authorities are extremely worried about this threat and during 1971 took a very great interest in the activities of the S.C.M. in Britain in the hope of being able to pin-point subversive elements before they got to South Africa. The Left became aware that they were the subject of this scrutiny, which is the reason why there were numerous "shock" reports in the "liberal" press of alleged activities of the Bureau of State Security (BOSS) in London, and the reason why a series of scare questions on the same subject were asked by Leftist M.P.'s in the House of Commons.

So far as can be ascertained, this publicity caused the South African security authorities to draw their horns in so far as investigative operations in Britain were concerned. Meanwhile, the Europe-Africa Project, and its allies have intensified their operations.

In addition to the Europe-Africa Project, the S.C.M. also operates an important section of teachers and student teachers. The purpose of this group is to promote the further communisation of the British educational system, and to place in British classrooms "Christian" subversives who can be relied upon to promote the multi-racialist point of view. Another very active department of the S.C.M. is its Peoples' Tribunal Project which takes an active interest in "Police harrassment of the Black Community". Both the Educational Group and the Peoples' Tribunal Project cross pollinate with Communist dominated organisations of considerable notoriety. The Education Group co-operates closely with the Communist Party dominated Teachers Against Racism (TAR) (see: 'Trouble-Shooting', *Spearhead*, May 1972, and 'T.A.R.: A Marxist Front', *Spearhead*, December 1972). The Peoples' Tribunal Project operates under the wing of the Communist dominated National Council for Civil Liberties.

OESTREICHER AGAIN

In a brochure entitled 'SCM in London' which was issued to students at the L.S.E. and other London colleges last year, the

Contd. on page 14

AUSTRALIA started to pay the price of electing a Socialist government from the moment it took office.

Prime Minister Gough Whitlam decided:

To end diplomatic relations with (pro-West) Nationalist China and to recognise the Communist regime on the Chinese mainland.

To ban White South African sports teams from Australia.

To end conscription and to release imprisoned draft dodgers.

To support tougher UN threats of sanctions and worse against the White Governments of Rhodesia and South Africa.

Luckily Australians are not a gutless breed. When Whitlam ordered New South Wales to shut down the Rhodesian Information Office in Sydney, the Premier of New South Wales slated Mr. Whitlam as "a political troglodyte" and said that he would not take orders from anyone.

"New South Wales is a sovereign state and nobody gives us orders" said the NSW Premier, gamely resisting the Socialist diktat.

WHEN about 150 Sinn Fein supporters gathered outside the Irish Embassy building in Grosvenor Place recently, they found the doors locked and permission refused for a pro-IRA demonstration there.

The event was a washout – literally. One local resident, at a third storey window, in a nearby building, flung down four buckets of water on them – the last of them hot.

BRITISH housewives are facing rocketing meat prices. Why? Because with a world shortage of beef, the government is continuing to support the export of home produced meat to Europe.

Just one of the many 'advantages' of the European Common Market for the average Briton.

THE Communist *Morning Star* boasted that an anti-National Front march took place in Uxbridge in support of Labour candidate Miss Manuela Sykes. The pro-Labour march was backed by the Moscowline 'Communist Party', the Communist "International Socialists" and various other extreme left riff-raff.

Miss Sykes is a leading member of the anti-Zionist 'Council for the Advancement of Arab-British Understanding'.

No doubt, the Zionist circles, who normally underwrite left wing 'student' demonstrations, will now take careful note of this fact, and bear it in mind before they cash support the International Socialists, International Marxist Group and Young Communist League in the future

WEST Germany regards trade with East Germany as "Inter-German trade" and all such transactions take place without customs restrictions. West Germany is of course a member of the Common Market which has

MICHAEL LOBB

CONTRARY VIEWPOINT

high external tariffs.

"Inter-German trade" means that Swiss manufacturers and East European producers send goods to East Germany for finishing, labelling and packing. These goods then enter the Common Market via West Germany.

When Britain is forced into Europe, we shall have to slam the front door on goods from New Zealand, Australia, Canada, etc., but Communist and other foreign goods will be allowed to sneak in by the back door tariff-free through East Germany.

No wonder NATO countries are falling over themselves to recognise East Germany.

WHEN Soviet rocket-launchers were found to have been used by IRA terrorists in Northern Ireland, Ted Heath asked the Kremlin to help him trace their origin! What a buffoon that man is! From the days when Karl Marx was resident in London, it has been a Communist aim to detach Ireland from the rest of Britain. Now the Reds plan to turn Ireland into a sort of European "Cuba". The Official IRA is a Communist organisation with just that purpose in mind.

It's about time Westminster recognised that the Communists, for all their talk of 'peaceful co-existence', have never abandoned their plans to take over the World. The best way to stop Soviet arms reaching the IRA, is for British arms to start reaching the patriotic Ukrainian Insurgent Army or Nationalists in the Baltic States and Caucasus.

LABOUR M.P. Renee Short, who has been a persistent advocate of diplomatic recognition for the Communist Tyranny in East Germany, has been tub-thumping for this cause again in *Tribune*, the Socialist weekly paper.

This time she has cause for hope. NATO has given the go-ahead to its fifteen member states to open up negotiations for the establishment of bi-lateral relations with East Germany. It will be interesting to see what case is presented by the Westminster Government for diplomatic recognition of East Germany. Any argument advanced in the service of this cause would with equal validity be applied to recognition of the Government of Rhodesia!

AMONGST the consortia scrabbling to grab control over London's two new commercial radio stations, are those representing Press Publishing, Film and T.V. combines. So, if you expect more variety and more "free expression" in an increased number of broadcasting stations, you can shed your illusions right now. The control always goes to those who possess the magic power of Big Folding Money.

FED up with Britain's inflation and hoping that Europe will cure all our economic ills? Well, wait and see. Every Common Market country also has inflation. Perhaps the Establishment will proclaim Euro-inflation jolly and beneficial, like the Euro-Regulations, Euro-Taxes and Euro-Monopolies are supposed to be.

TWO and a half years ago, Wandsworth Council for Community Relations sponsored an organisation called "Help on Arrest" to help Immigrants involved in trouble with the police.

One man it couldn't help was himself a leading figure in "Help on Arrest" – Jude Benedict Akuta. He was found guilty at the Old Bailey early in December of possessing nearly 146 lbs. of cannabis worth nearly £50,000 on the black market.

TRIBE Sex is the sex of the future – according to much-publicised lunatic and biologist Dr. Alex Comfort. He has written an article called "Sexuality in a Zero Growth Society" for the monthly publication of the American "Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions". (The latter is described as 'an educational research institute'!)

We must live in a very sick society for such inane nonsense as this to be treated as being worthy of serious consideration by scientists and publicists the world over.

Pass on
SPEARHEAD
to your friends

WHEN the BBC approached us a few weeks ago stating their wish to make a television programme about the National Front we needed no telling of the intention behind it. It was not to carry out the function for which that corporation is supposed to exist — that of factual and objective reporting on current political trends; it was to use all the massive power of the number one public medium to denigrate the NF.

However, our reaction to this approach was prompted by the recognition that TV is today an unalterable part of political communication, and that all those who wish to gain political influence must take the opportunity to appear on it, whatever the risks.

We therefore extended to the BBC team all the courtesy and co-operation that could have been asked of us. A certain Mr. Colin Martin was their initial contact man with us. He appeared one day at our office all sweetness and charm, stressing how anxious he was to give us a fair deal and show that the BBC was not — contrary to what many might believe — deliberately left-wing. When we spoke of our previous experiences with his organisation and the consequent extreme scepticism with which we regarded his claim, he went to great lengths to persuade us that this time it would be different.

We gave Mr. Martin leave to go about seeing members of our movement, while my colleague Martin Webster granted him many hours of his very crowded time to talk to him about the NF. During the weeks in which the programme was being prepared I also spoke to Mr. Martin in order to ascertain from him broadly what the shape of the programme would be and to obtain from him certain assurances about fair treatment.

I made it clear to him that I did not expect the BBC to present the programme in a flourish of praise for the NF, or even to leave out of it the mention of controversial background facts. Indeed every fact relevant to the NF or its leaders that was true the BBC was quite entitled to mention. All I asked was that every aspect of the NF be presented in some kind of proportion and that we have ample opportunity to state our case on the main issues of the day.

Mr. Martin sought to assure me that I need have no fears on these matters. He said that the programme would begin, historically speaking, from the time of the formation of the NF, merely mentioning the various organisations that merged together to create it during 1966/7. He said that part of the programme would consist of an interview with myself in which I would be asked questions about the policy and ideology of the National Front. I asked did this mean that I would have the opportunity to state our position on all the important political issues, such as Immigration, the Common Market, the Economy, Northern Ireland, Law and Order, etc. He replied that it did.

PAST POLITICAL RECORD

I knew of course from the outset that the programme would make mention of the past political record of myself and some of my colleagues. I have never sought to hide from anyone the fact that several years ago, when I was a much younger man — indeed of an age when few men's political judgement is truly mature — I was for a short time a member of Mr. Colin Jordan's National Socialist Movement. There is nothing really remarkable or unique in such an association. Countless men who are today regarded as respectable political leaders — indeed in some cases eminent world statesmen — had a brief involvement with extremism in their youth. More often than not it is the extremism of the left, but sometimes, as in my own case, it can be other extremes. Later I changed a number of my opinions, in particular coming to realise that Fascist or Nazi style dictatorship would never work in Britain and that national resurgence in our country should be sought by methods wholly British and not an imitation of foreigners. Though some of my former beliefs were mistaken, I will never acknowledge that there was anything dishonourable about

JOHN TYNDALL on that programme

"We did deceive you"

— Say the BBC

holding them. From an early age I was deeply concerned about the state of my country and at an early age decided to try and do something about it rather than sit in an armchair letting things rot, as some of my countrymen are prepared to do. I believed that radical change was needed and wanted to take action that would awaken people to the need for that change. In the desire to take action quickly I took action that was misguided and ill-considered. That is a thing that many young men do. Are such men more or less deserving of condemnation than those who take no action at all but out of cowardice or selfishness turn their backs on everything and feather their own personal beds? I have no doubt as to the answer.

Just a few — a very small minority — of my colleagues made the same early mistakes as I did and later, recognising their mistakes, changed course, joining together with people of many different political backgrounds, and some of no political background at all, in the National Front.

As the programme, however, was about the National Front and only about the National Front we did not expect the BBC to include in its extensive film of the activities and the personalities of other organisations. It was on this understanding that we gave our co-operation in the first place: had any other possibility been admitted, the BBC would have been left to go ahead with their film without our co-operation and without the privilege of using our facilities.

As the programme, however, was about the National Front and only about the National Front we did not expect the BBC to include in its extensive film of the activities and the personalities of other organisations. It was on this understanding that we gave our co-operation in the first place: had any other possibility been admitted, the BBC would have been left to go ahead with their film without our co-operation and without the privilege of using our facilities.

The interview proceeded, and it had not gone far before I realised that the promise that it would be devoted to questions on NF policy was just pure deception employed to get me into the interviewee's chair. I stopped the show and asked Mr. Martin how he reconciled the pattern that the interview was following with these previous promises. Ah! he said, I need not worry. Any points of policy not covered would come out in filmed excerpts from speeches that would be shown on the programme. Though this did not adequately cover my complaint about broken promises, I agreed to carry on.

In the end not a single question was asked

to bring out any of the facts about the National Front. Instead a succession of small side issues were raised, all with the intention of putting me on the defensive. Why did I break with Colin Jordan? What was my comment on a statement made that 2 per cent of the NF consisted of evil men? Why did Mr. John O'Brien leave the NF? Did I consider NF members a 'chosen people'? And so on round the mulberry bush.

The question as to whether I considered the members of the NF a 'chosen people' struck me as about the silliest of a series of silly questions. By that time the atmosphere of silliness had become so contagious that in a moment of exasperation I decided that the question deserved an equally silly answer. I replied "Aren't the Jews the chosen people?"

Silence. Face of interviewer goes blank. Quickly I decide that the silliness has to end, and I ask for a cut and retake of the question in accordance with my rights as the programme man explained them. This is done.

The interview concluded with my feeling that once again the BBC had been less than honest with us. I did not waste any further time arguing with the interviewer, a distinctly foreign looking type despite his English sounding name of Cockerell; I simply awaited the showing of the programme with the feeling that in the future we should trust the corporation even less than we had on this occasion.

ACTUAL PROGRAMME UNRECOGNISABLE

The actual programme when it appeared was unrecognisable from the one that we had been promised. Far from being a programme about the National Front, as we had been led to understand, it ranged far and wide across the spectrum of the political fringe, featuring personalities and activities having nothing whatever to do with the NF. Mr. Colin Jordan was filmed speaking in Trafalgar Square in 1962 praising Nazi Germany. Sir Oswald Mosley was shown orating at Olympia in 1936, complete with blackshirt. The same gentleman was pictured marching through London in SS type garb acknowledging the cheers of his followers with a Hitler style salute, then ironically was brought on to be interviewed during which he condemned people who dress up in uniforms in imitation of foreign political movements.

Mr. Jordan was also interviewed, and my calculation is that in the end both the interviews with him and Sir Oswald extended for longer than the one with myself — in a programme that was supposed to be about the National Front! In the end the interview in which I was supposed to be given a chance to expound what the NF stood for was cut down to a few seconds and was limited to three questions, none of them dealing with NF policy.

One was about some comments made about certain members of the NF by its former Chairman, Mr. A. K. Chesterton. My answer to this was cut off half way. Another asked me what I thought of

being called a 'racialist' – to which I gave the obvious answer that it didn't bother me in the least. The third was the one dealing with 'chosen people'. Here the BBC showed its true colours typically. It featured the very piece that I had asked to be cut, thus going back on its promises and violating what I was given to understand was standard BBC procedure. It then admitted that I had asked for the shot to be cut and showed the process of retaking. Many telephone calls that we had in the week following indicated that here the TV hatchet men had overplayed their hand and exhibited a despicable trickery that sickened plenty of ordinary viewers. In fact so glaringly did this action betray the intentions of the TV men that it wrote bias thick and large over the whole of the rest of the programme.

JORDAN'S TRAFALGAR SQUARE SPEECH

Was Jordan's Trafalgar Square speech relevant to the National Front – founded four years after it was made? In the minds of the BBC men, apparently. But in that case they should have been honest with us from the outset and not tried to deceive us that the programme was only about the NF. In that case we would have simply said "go ahead and do your worst but don't expect any co-operation from us." Mr. Webster and I would not have wasted our time giving interviews. The camera team would not have been allowed on our premises.

And surely if Jordan's speech had relevance to ourselves on the grounds that one or two of our members once worked with him, it would have been appropriate to have had an excerpt from one of the war-time speeches of Winston Churchill, since a great many more of our members were in the Tory Party at the time that he was its leader.

No, neither Jordan nor Mosley had any relevance at all, but were slyly dug out of limbo by the BBC to try to discredit the National Front.

It might be added that the first question I was asked in my interview was "Why did you leave Jordan?" My answer – that I did not like the foreign associations of his movement and wanted a movement that was 100 per cent British in inspiration and in style – was naturally left out of the eventual showing of the programme.

Apart from Mosley and Jordan, the cavalcade of non-NF people given generous time by the cameras included the pathetic John O'Brien, whose exit from the NF last summer marked the start of its recent great resurgence. Mr. O'Brien, photographed in the placid setting of rural Shropshire, obliged the BBC smearmongers by coming out with a load of unadulterated piffle about contacts that we were supposed to have with German Nazis. The BBC did not even hint to me during the making of the programme that these allegations had been made and were going to be featured, let alone give me the chance to answer them. Had I been given that chance I would have named them for what they were – damnable lies. Such things, however, as giving a man a chance to answer despicable smears against him do not figure among the ethics of the BBC.

VILE PIECE OF WORK

Another vile piece of work was the programme's reference to my Worthing friend and colleague, Oliver Gilbert. Mr. Gilbert has done sterling work for the patriotic cause in Britain for many years, but would be the last to claim that he was amongst the most prominent personalities of the National Front today. However, while many people of greater prominence in the movement were not mentioned at all the programme concentrated great attention on Mr. Gilbert. Why? Because thirty or forty years ago he ran an electrical business that was advertised in a Fascist newspaper! That was not all, however. The dirty little maggots of the BBC then went on to make reference to

Mr. Gilbert's present employment – with what could only have been the object of compromising his position with his employers.

Needless to say, in the end the aspects of NF policy of which there had been nothing asked in the interview were not featured in excerpts from speeches in the eventual showing. The BBC realised that too much of this policy is attractive to too many members of the public. It was deliberately suppressed.

When I telephoned Mr. Martin after the showing of the programme to give him my opinion of it, he seemed most pained that I could not share his assessment that it was thoroughly fair! In answer to my challenges on specific points, there was a carefully rehearsed series of evasions and soft soap. After arguing for about twenty minutes, I realised that trying to establish a common understanding of truth and untruth with these people is like trying to grasp your hand around slime. There is just nothing to hold on to, only a sticky liquid mass that slips through your fingers and forms again the next moment in a single front against you.

What we did get from Mr. Martin was the following admission, and I quote: "We did deceive you to some extent concerning our full intentions, but had you been aware of what we had in mind to include in the programme you would not have extended us your co-operation."

Comment is superfluous.

What effect can such a programme have had on the public? It is very difficult to say. Undoubtedly, some stunted minds would have been

taken in by the Nazi and Fascist innuendo that ran right through it, but the question has to be asked: would these minds be receptive to the National Front in the first place anyway? Certainly, the type of virile and clear mind required to get the NF message through the incessant din of left-liberal propaganda served up to the public is likely to have seen through the programme and recognised its bias and dishonesty – as many did who 'phoned and wrote to us the next day. Perhaps, as I suspect, the whole thing was aimed at neither of these elements but against our own members themselves, not with the object of changing their basic opinions but of setting them against some of their colleagues. That there has been no sign of this succeeding so far does not make it any the less a likely objective. Our members are never given the credit for commonsense and sturdy independence of mind that they deserve. Opponents – befuddled by the image of us that they love to project out of their own imagination – always underestimate us somehow.

One thing is quite certain. The case for the indictment of the BBC as a politically prejudiced organisation, riddled with extreme leftists prepared to use totalitarian techniques to demolish their opponents and utterly unmoved by British concepts of fair play, has been strengthened with yet another mass of evidence. As I told their man on the 'phone, the balance of power which now so overwhelmingly rests in their favour will not always remain the same. There will come a time when these termites will have cause to bitterly regret their behaviour today. No more need be said.

New *Unhappy Lords*: Latest Edition Now Available at £1

Ever since its first publication in 1965, *The New Unhappy Lords* by A. K. Chesterton has been the subject of much reference by our magazine. It has always seemed to our Editor to be the most comprehensive and best written book analysing the causes of British decline in the post-war period.

The theme of international conspiracy, in which Communism and High Finance form two complementary poles, is not new; it has been dealt with in numerous books by authors of many nations, writing in many languages, and a vast literature is now available on the subject. What can be said to commend *The Lords* particularly to readers of our magazine is that it is written very much from the British point of view and that its tone is calm and rational.

Mr. Chesterton was one of the founders of the National Front and was its Chairman from 1966 to 1970. Since then he has concentrated his work on writing and publishing mainly the journal *Candour*, which has served as a superbly accurate commentary on political affairs since the early 1950s and to which the Editor of *Spearhead* is indebted for much of the knowledge and understanding that goes into our own magazine.

Previous to *Candour* is a long life spent in journalism and political activity, punctuated by service with distinction in both world wars.

The basic theme of *The New Unhappy Lords* is that the collapse of British Empire and world power has not been a natural

and inevitable development of recent history but has been contrived – as part of a general assault on nationhood all over at least the Western World with a view to the setting up of world government. Many treaties, agreements and institutions which hold quite a respectable place in the eyes of the uninformed millions are exposed in the book as being no less subversive to the national interest than the more obvious and overt forms of Communist subversion.

Understanding of this theme is essential to an understanding of what is wrong with Britain and what can be done to remedy it.

The new edition of the book brings events right up to date, dealing in an additional final chapter with the most recent developments in Britain's Common Market entry. The criticism could be made that this final chapter might have dealt also with the assault on Britain through Northern Ireland, which is very much relevant to the main theme of the book.

In this last chapter the author has been good enough to make reference to the role of the National Front in fighting for the revival of Britain and in the list of recommended journals *Spearhead* is included.

The edition is in paper-back (250 pp.) and sells at £1. Nationalist Books, the National Front subsidiary, has bought 1,000 copies and we hope that everyone will help in getting the book to an ever wider section of the public. It could be a first class New Year or birthday present to friends during 1973.

THE LIBERAL-LEFT SYNDROME

We print on this page some of the standard liberal-leftist principles of ideology — and their antitheses. The extracts are from *Suicide of the West* by James Burnham.

Human nature is changing and plastic, with an indefinite potential for progressive development, and no innate obstacles to the realization of the good society of peace, justice, freedom and well-being.

Human nature exhibits constant as well as changing attributes. It is at least partially defective or corrupt intrinsically, and thus limited in its potential for progressive development; in particular, incapable of realizing the good society of peace, justice, freedom and well-being.

Human beings are basically rational; reason and science are the only proper means for discovering truth and are the sole standard of truth, to which authority, custom, intuition, revelation, etc., must give way.

Human beings are moved by sentiment, passion, intuition and other non-rational impulses at least as much as by reason. Any view of man, history and society that neglects the non-rational impulses and their embodiment in custom, prejudice, tradition and authority, or that conceives of a social order in which the non-rational impulses and their embodiments are wholly subject to abstract reason, is an illusion.

The obstacles to progress and the achievement of the good society are ignorance and faulty social institutions.

Besides ignorance and faulty social institutions there are many other obstacles to progress and the achievement of the good society: some rooted in the biological, psychological, moral and spiritual nature of man; some, in the difficulties of the terrestrial environment; others, in the intransigence of nature; still others, derived from man's loneliness in the material universe.

Because of the extrinsic and remediable nature of the obstacles, it follows that there are solutions to every social problem, and that progress and the good society can be achieved; historical optimism is justified.

Since there are intrinsic and permanent as well as extrinsic and remediable obstacles, the good society of universal peace, justice, freedom and well-being cannot be achieved, and there are no solutions to most of the primary social problems — which are, in truth, not so much "problems" as permanent conditions of human existence. Plans based on the goal of realizing the ideal society or solving the primary problems are likely to be dangerous as well as utopian, and to lessen rather than increase the probability of bringing about the moderate improvement and partial solutions that are in reality possible.

The fact that an institution, belief or mode of conduct has existed for a long time does not create any presumption in favour of continuing it.

Although traditional institutions, beliefs and modes of conduct can get so out of line with real conditions as to become intolerable handicaps to human well-being there is a certain presumption in their favour as part of the essential fabric of society; a strong presumption against changing them both much and quickly.

In order to get rid of ignorance, it is necessary and sufficient that there should be ample, universal education based on reason and science.

There is no indication from experience that universal education based on reason and science — even if it were possible, which it is not — can actually eliminate or even much reduce the kinds of ignorance that bear on individual and social conduct.

The bad institutions can be got rid of by

democratic political, economic and social reform.

There is no indication from experience that all bad institutions can be got rid of by democratic or any other kind of reforms; if some bad institutions are eliminated some of the institutions remaining, or some that replace them, will be bad or will become bad.

It is society — through its bad institutions and its failure to eliminate ignorance — that is responsible for social evils. Our attitude toward those who embody these evils — of crime, delinquency, war, hunger, unemployment, communism, urban blight — should be not retributive but rather the permissive, rehabilitating, educating approach of social service; and our main concern should be the elimination of the social conditions that are the source of the evils.

There are biological, psychological and moral as well as social causes of the major evils of society. A programme of social reform combined with a merely permissive, educational and reformist approach to those who embody the evils not only has no prospect of curing the evils — which is in any event impossible — but in practice often fosters rather than mitigates them, and fails to protect the healthier sectors of society from victimization.

Education must be thought of as a universal dialogue in which all teachers and students above elementary levels may express their opinions, with complete academic freedom.

Unrestricted academic freedom expresses the loosening of an indispensable social cohesion and the decay of standards, and permits or promotes the erosion of the social order. Academic discourse should recognize, and if necessary be required to recognize, the limits implicit in the consensus concerning goals, values and procedures that is integral to the society in question.

Politics must also be thought of as a universal dialogue in which all persons may express their opinions, whatever they may be, with complete freedom.

Unrestricted free speech in relation to political matters — most obviously when extended to those who reject the basic premises of the given society and utilize freedom of speech as a device for attacking the society's foundations — expresses, like unrestricted academic freedom, the loosening of social cohesion and the decay of standards, and condones the erosion of the social order.

Since we cannot be sure what the objective truth is, if there is any such thing, we must grant every man the right to hold and express his own opinion, whatever it may be; and, for practical purposes as we go along, be content to abide by the democratic decision of the majority.

Whether or not there is any truth that is both objective and capable of being known to be so, no society can preserve constitutional government or even prevent dissolution unless in practice it holds certain truths to be, if not literally self-evident, then at any rate unalterable for it, and not subject to the changing will of the popular majority or of any other human sovereign.

Government should rest as directly as possible on the will of the people, with each adult human being counting as one and one only, irrespective of sex, colour, race, religion, ancestry, property or education.

A number of principles have been appealed to as the legitimate basis of government, and most of these have been associated in the course of time with bad, indifferent and moderately good government. Government resting on unqualified universal franchise — especially where the electorate includes sizeable proportions of uneducated or propertyless persons, or cohesive sub-groups — tends to degenerate into semi-anarchy or into forms of despotism (Caesarism, Bonapartism) that manipulate the

democratic formula for anti-democratic ends.

Since there are no differences among human beings considered in their political capacity as the foundation of legitimate, that is democratic, government, the ideal state will include all human beings, and the ideal government is world government. Meanwhile, short of the ideal, we should support and strengthen the United Nations, the World Court and other partial steps toward an international political order and world government, as these become successively possible in practice.

In their existential reality, human beings differ so widely that their natural and prudent political ordering is into units more limited and varied than a world state. A world state having no roots in human memory, feeling and custom, would inevitably be abstract and arbitrary, thus despotic, in the foreseeable future, if it could conceivably be brought into being. Though modern conditions make desirable more international cooperation than in the past, we should be cautious in relation to internationalizing institutions, especially when these usurp functions heretofore performed by more parochial bodies.

In social, economic and cultural as well as political affairs, men are of right equal. Social reform should be designed to correct existing inequalities and to equalize the conditions of nurture, schooling, residence, employment, recreation and income that produce them.

It is neither possible nor desirable to eliminate all inequalities among human beings. Although it is charitable and prudent to take reasonable measures to temper the extremes of inequality, the obsessive attempt to eliminate inequalities by social reforms and sanctions provokes bitterness and disorder, and can at most only substitute new inequalities for the old.

Social hierarchies and distinctions among human beings are bad and should be eliminated, especially those distinctions based on custom, tradition, prejudice, superstition and other non-rational sources, such as race, colour, ancestry, property (particularly landed and inherited property) and religion.

It is impossible and undesirable to eliminate hierarchies and distinctions among human beings. A large number of distinctions and groupings, rational and non-rational, contributes to the variety and richness of civilization, and should be welcomed, except where some gross and remediable cruelty or inequity is involved.

Sub-groups of humanity defined by colour, race, sex or other physical or physiological attributes do not differ in civilizing potential.

Whether or not sub-groups of humanity defined by physical or physiological attributes differ congenitally and innately in civilizing potential, they do differ in their actual civilizing ability at the present time and are likely to continue so to differ for as long in the future as is of practical concern.

The goal of social and political life is secular: to increase the material and functional well-being of humanity.

Among the goals of political and social life, well-being is subordinate to survival; and all secular goals are in the last analysis subordinate to the ultimate moral or religious goals of the citizens composing the community.

It is always preferable to settle disputes among groups, classes and nations, as among individuals, by free discussion, negotiation and compromise, not by conflict, coercion or war.

Disputes among groups, classes and nations can and should be settled by free discussion, negotiation and compromise when — but only when —

Continued on next page

WITH the extensive publicity given to Messrs. Jensen, Shockley and Eysenck in recent years, men of undeniable eminence in their respective academic fields, the liberal establishment has had to adjust its public theory of race from that which takes for granted the equality of all races to that which claims that nobody really knows, that there is no substantial scientific evidence to decide one way or the other. Whereas all previous racialists were brushed aside as "uneducated bigots" by the establishment, the reputations of these scientists rendered such tactics impossible.

The liberal élite therefore concentrated on confusionist tactics such as picking holes in the methodology of the scientists, claiming that their findings were a long way from suggesting anything and countering the evidence with the theories of armchair anthropologists of dubious political persuasion. That modern research proves nothing is a demonstrably false conception. Liberals appear to possess all the relevant facts on the subject but not the wit to see their logical connection and the irrefutable conclusions that can be drawn from them. I propose in this article to undertake that task in their default.

To leave aside racial differences for the moment, it is commonly claimed by liberals that there has been no progress in recent years towards discovering whether heredity or environment is the greater determinant of intelligence. There are very many authorities to which one could refer to show the nonsense of this assertion, not least to Professor Richard Lynn and his study of the genetic implications of the "brain drain" (*New Scientist*, 20.3.69), but it is not necessary to refer to reputations. All that is necessary is a simple demonstration of the elementary logic to be applied to the facts that we have at present.

Identical twins are genetically equal. They arise from the division of a single cell and therefore possess identical genes and consequently identical inherited characteristics. A large number of experiments have been conducted by different authorities on such twins, separated at birth and reared in completely different socio-economic environments (e.g. Burt in *British Journal of*

LIBERAL LEFT SYNDROME

Contd.

the disputes range within some sort of common framework of shared ideas and interests. When the disputes arise out of a clash of basic interests and an opposition of root ideas, as is from time to time inevitably the case, then they cannot be settled by negotiation and compromise but must be resolved by power, coercion and sometimes war.

Government, representing the common good democratically determined, has the duty of guaranteeing that everyone should have enough food, shelter, clothing and education, and security against unemployment, illness and the problems of old age.

Except in marginal and extreme cases, the duty of government is not to assure citizens food, shelter, clothing and education, and security against the hazards of unemployment, illness and old age, but to maintain conditions within which the citizens, severally and in association, are free to make their own arrangements as they see fit.

ANDREW CONIAM

A DEMOLITION OF THE LIBERAL RACE DOCTRINE

Educational Psychology, 1954, No. 24; Shields in *Monozygotic Twins*, Oxford, 1962; and Vernon in *Educational Research*, 1959, No. 1). Disregarding brain damage, in none of the pairs was the difference in intelligence found to be more than a few points. In the vast majority of cases where the social, economic and educational environment differed, it was found that the intelligence of each twin was virtually identical with that of its sibling, i.e. with one or two points of difference.

It seems ridiculous to have to keep asking such questions, but does the liberal understand the conclusive significance of these findings? Genetically identical twins must by the laws of genetics have the same hereditary intelligence. If therefore the intelligences of such siblings differ, the difference must be the result of environmental differences. If they do not differ under different environments, then heredity must be the more important factor. The fact that they differ only slightly when reared in different environments, whilst unrelated children reared in the same environment differ widely, proves that the environment plays a lesser role than heredity. This is not a matter of opinion or mere theory, as liberals have attributed to Jensen. There are no ifs or buts about it. It is plain, logical, unimpeachable fact. Has that registered, liberals?

RACIAL DIFFERENCES

Bearing in mind this inescapable fact, let us return to the subject of racial differences. It has been known for very many years that the average Negro scores from 15 to 20 points below the White on whatever type of intelligence test, verbal or otherwise, that we may care to give him (see Shuey, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, 1966). Since we know from the investigation of identical twins that environmental differences cannot account for an average difference of that magnitude, it follows that a substantial part of this difference must be due to hereditary factors, (see Jensen in *Harvard Educational Review*, February, 1969).

From this we can see that the argument about "culture-fair" tests is a red herring. The culture of a group must either be an ex-

pression of its innate characteristics or an environmental factor passed on by learning. If it is the former then Jensen's theory stands. If it is environmental then it counts for little as we have seen.

Whilst admitting that the environment may account for a little of the white-black ability gulf, we may also ask whether the cultural life of American blacks is significantly different to that of the poor Whites. Do the slum dwelling Whites of America have a significantly different sub-culture to that of the Negroes in the northern states with their integrated schools? Are the cultural differences between Whites and Red Indians less than those between Whites and city dwelling Negroes? For certainly the Indians have the poorest economic and educational conditions, yet they have a higher average I.Q. than the Negroes. Is the language structure and social attitude of the middle class non-ghetto American Negro significantly different from that of ordinary Whites, bearing in mind that the I.Q. gulf has been found to operate at every social level (Deutsch and Brown, *Journal of Social Issues*, 1964, No. 20)? Is the fact that the gulf still appears when non-verbal tests are used, of no importance? Why throughout history has European peasantry, with much more varying cultures, continually thrown up men of genius with little education or cultural encouragement?

But such questions are not really necessary. No responsible person has ever denied that the environment, cultural or otherwise, plays some part, least of all Jensen. The fact is that these environmental factors account for only a few points.

Similarly, the argument about the validity of intelligence tests is quite irrelevant. If you don't think they measure "intelligence", then don't call it intelligence, but there is absolutely no doubt that they measure an ability of some sort and this ability has been found to relate very closely to civilised achievement and is highly predictive of such achievement (see Lovell, *Educational Psychology and Children*, London, 1964).

That the sum total of modern research has been like water off a duck's back to the liberal establishment, should now be apparent. Even if it is admitted that nothing can ever be "proved", one hundred per-cent, it is an example of "ostrich-mindedness" to pretend that an overwhelming probability of racial inequality does not exist.

ASIANS HARASSING OLD FOLK TO SELL HOMES

ELDERLY women living alone in Bolton are being harassed by Asian immigrants who want to buy their homes.

This is reported by the MP for Bolton West, Mr. Robert Redmond, who says the practice has "got well beyond the bounds of reason."

"They almost invariably have wads of notes waved under their noses and refusals are never taken seriously," says Mr. Redmond, in a letter to Mr. David Lane, Parliamentary Secretary at the Home Office.

"I am told this is happening night after night, and they get the impression that they will never be left in peace until they agree to sell.

"I would doubt from what I hear that while there is an offer of cash, it reaches the true and up-to-date value of the property."

Mr. Redmond says he accepts that a person cannot be prevented by law from offering to buy a house, but that a line has to be drawn between what is reasonable behaviour and what is not.

REASON

"You will find that, in Bolton at least, the practice has now got well beyond the bounds of reason," he tells Mr. Lane.

"In the past I have tried, without any success, to find out who is behind this nasty business. The ladies in question have simply not known and have just told the persistent canvasser to 'get lost'.

"Now, however, I have met one lady who has been able to identify at least one of the racketeers, who is known to you and me as a rather notorious character.

"The constituent in question admits to having said she would sell if the Corporation would allot her a council flat.

"She was told by the persistent character who was putting her under pressure that he had influence with me, and that I would help her to get a council flat."

ADVICE

Mr. Redmond calls this statement "outrageous," and says that police are advising such residents to report any cases of annoyance.

Bolton's Borough Solicitor, Mr. David Hoggins, today confirmed that Mr. Redmond had written to him about this problem.

"There is no way the Corporation can

protect ladies in this predicament," said Mr. Hoggins. "There is legal protection for tenants who are harassed by landlords, but not for householders.

"People faced with this kind of approach will just have to take a firm line — although I know that this is not always easy, particularly for old people."

The letter below, which appeared recently in the SEVENOAKS CHRONICLE, is reprinted because we think it makes a good case and tells a story.

Hostel families pray nightly for Enoch as P.M.

MAY I REDRESS your reporter's one-sided account of the National Front's demonstration outside the large Asian bridgehead at West Malling ex-RAF Battle of Britain anti-invasion airfield.

I feared there would be such bias from young Press reporters. I suppose one can understand this coming from those whose lives have been so snugly cocooned, from the nursery, within an affluent permissive society . . . a society which in its softness now overlooks its most solemn responsibility, which is to protect and preserve its own people and their familiar way of life.

I dispute the report because:

(1) It states the protestors failed to gain support from the English families living in the nearby King Hill hostel. This is false since when, in company with others that afternoon, I toured those dark grim huts, the families were near to tears about their own hapless plight (as compared to the newly-arrived Asians' luxury arrangements nearby).

Some families, whose children were very well kept, despite their Oliver Twist circumstances, told me they prayed nightly for Mr. Enoch Powell to be Prime Minister of Britain.

(2) Entirely on their own initiative, and unaccompanied by any adults whatsoever, a whole host of children from that grim English camp, skipped along the road to the Police cordon outside the Asians' luxury quarters. These children, without the slightest encouragement from any adults present, then chanted their own most moving Save Britain protest. Out of the mouths of babes . . .

I belong to no political organisation. But I do support any which I consider are patriotically battling to save their own country from being transformed beyond recogni-

tion into a coloured majority within our grandchildren's lifetime (Ronald Bell, QC, a patriotic Tory MP, has full undeniable statistics on this).

In the sharp decline of Britons, resulting from the human sacrifice in two exhausting world wars within 20 years, and the vacuum of the Surrender of Empire, our country is in immediate danger of decaying unto death like Ancient Rome and other

fallen empires who were also overrun by alien immigrants when they lost the will to preserve themselves.

We still have our patriots. I meet many in my daily round as an industrial journalist all over Britain, from the forthright essence of feminine English courage of Mrs. Barbara De Havilland, who appears from time to time in your columns, to a rapidly increasing number of young people who, as they instinctively grope their way towards what patriotism is all about, are inherently of the same breed and calibre of my

friends Air Vice Marshal Donald ("Pathfinder") Bennett and Group Captain Douglas Bader.

It is also no coincidence that the British Legion war disabled who make the Remembrance Day Poppies also now make "Enoch for Britain" laced badges.

For these men, whose bodies were mutilated for life as they fought to prevent their country being invaded, have lived to see their country invaded—yes, invaded—by alien hordes in peacetime.

Ask the Metropolitan Police (as opposed to Kent rural Police — or West Malling's Chamber of Commerce) for the Met Police are at least 90 per cent on the side of Enoch Powell, because, regarding mass immigration, they have to battle night and day, in the front line, protecting you and I against the disastrous expediencies of politicians (and the clergy at the highest level) who preach for others what they do not have to practise for themselves.

Ask any English person who lives in Southall, Bradford, Birmingham, Wolverhampton or scores of other besieged English cities, and you will find out what is really happening to Britain which in Shakespeare's immortal words, is, "This fortress built by nature for herself . . . against the envy of less happy lands . . ." GEOFFREY WOOD

The Garden Cottage,
Ightham Court,
Ightham.

POWELL AND GOVERNMENT WRONG ON INFLATION

After what surely must have been the greatest debate on Inflation in British history, with the BBC pulling out all the stops, and Tripartite Talks between Government, the Council for British Industry, and the Trade Union Council, the consensus is that the growth in money supply has been excessive, and has been one of the main causes of inflation, but too drastic curtailment of the increase in supply will increase unemployment. We are left therefore with two schools of thought, one advocating the vital need to reduce unemployment at the risk of continued inflation, and the other, the need to reduce inflation at all costs, because this is deadly to the nation. Mr. Powell is a passionate supporter of the latter school of thought, regardless of the fact that people must suffer from what may well be an increase in unemployment.

The Government has adopted a compromise course of reducing the supply of money and pegging prices and wages for a period during which further conversations may be held on which course is the better — the fire or the frying pan.

THE MYSTERIOUS BACKGROUND TO MONETARY POLICY

The Editor of the *Daily Telegraph* (10.11.72) heads his column *Banks Unrestrained*. He speaks of the continued rise in money supply being around 20 per cent a year, and of the Governor of the Bank of England having "in effect said (as well he might) that monetary expansion was too rapid...." Now the curious thing is that the new policy of expansion of a new order, based on 12½ per cent reserves instead of the old (though not exactly comparable 30 per cent) was attributed to the present Governor in his "Competition and Credit Control" adopted last year, hence the enigma of the words in parenthesis above.

Secondly, in the column dealing with the new Government ruling on bank lending on page 1 of the same issue the writer states that the growth of money supply has been, during the summer, at an annual rate of 30 per cent, and that the Government has decided to moderate this rate to be consistent with its prices and incomes policy. And this is followed by a spokesman for a leading bank saying that the call for special deposits must make for dearer money to borrow.

It is perfectly clear from the above that the Government is directly responsible for allowing the excessive inflation by the banks and, if the above statement about interest rates is true, it defeats the Government policy of fixing prices. Why should banks increase

borrowing rates especially when they, almost alone, are making handsome profits.

TIME FOR THE REAL CONFRONTATION

We unhesitatingly affirm that the consensus which believes that the nation has only two courses open, and that we must seek a perilous mid way between the two evils of inflation and unemployment, is basically untrue. It has been arrived at because of the unwillingness to face the economic facts of the modern world; because we accept as infallible rules of finance which may or may not have served us well in the past, but now are completely incapable of dealing satisfactorily with the task of ensuring that modern production is used for the benefit of man. The profit motive is good, and free enterprise is good, if the money is good. So called money, created by manipulation of bank reserves, which ensures a predominance of bank power in the nation, whatever the extent of its labours, is false economics and should now be challenged before disaster overtakes the nation.

Referring to Lord Balogh's definition of money before the Select Committee hearing on the Bank of England, there is only one true source of money, and that is, the State.

For generations, the State has mortgaged its credit, and therefore its own special powers, and the wealth of the nation, in order

to obtain the use of its credit on paper and in paper, from privileged sources and in so doing has brought about the present impasse. This, unhappily, is what Mr. Powell seems congenitally unable to comprehend. He has proved himself the most able man for presenting an unpopular case when his convictions have led him that way, but it is regretted in the extreme that he clings to bygone traditions regarding the necessity for the State to borrow money from the privately owned banking system, and pay compound interest in perpetuity, when the State has the power and the duty (in Abraham Lincoln's words) to supply that money and credit, at no cost. The former method of finance binds the nation hand and foot, whereas the latter method releases its powers of growth. For twelve generations we have been caged by money-lenders, and prevented from using the resources we possess by their withholding licences to work (money) while these licences were allowed to be fabricated by Government default.

Mr. Powell, have we been duped? Have you been duped? Was Abraham Lincoln duped? If God has given us all the necessities for a good life, and a million men willing to make more goods and services, do we really need bits of paper or the consent of the Bank of England before we create new homes, new hospitals, and new hopes for our people? Let the bankers partake of our prosperity, but not make money out of the denial of national rights, with wealth for some and poverty for the many, while surrounded by unused resources. This is the old paradox of poverty amidst plenty spoken of by Bishop Berkeley (1745) and William Cobbett (1820). As Lord Norman said, "The dogs bark but the caravan moves on." It is high time this caravan was halted.

THOUGHT FOR THE MONTH

In a shooting war it is easy to distinguish those who have been wounded from those who are still sound, and to place the disabled well behind the battle line where, if they can no longer fight, they will not be a burden to those who can.

Psychological warfare too has its walking wounded, some of them gifted individuals who could be most useful — but not in the thick of battle.

The trouble is that these "propaganda shell-shock cases" do not always understand their own condition; they are therefore inclined to regard their reaction to the propaganda of the Left as normal and sensible and those of their unwounded comrades who cannot be so easily intimidated as rash, dangerous and foolish.

And so we find, as the propaganda heat is turned on, that tensions and antagonisms are liable to arise in our ranks among people who are 100 per cent in agreement as to aims and ends, with the danger always of a separation into two camps — in the one camp those who can stand a lot of heat and pressure, and in the other camp who would do almost anything to have the heat turned off.

These are realities of the psychological war which I discuss with some trepidation because I know that in these matters, where unity itself is at stake, the deepest feelings of individuals are involved.

A soldier can wear his wounds with pride, but no-one would willingly admit that he has become a casualty of psychological warfare, that he has become a propaganda shell-shock case.

Ivor Benson

THE OPINION MAKERS

Liberals - Fifth Columnists of Communism

Reprinted with acknowledgements to S.A. *Observer*, P.O. Box 2401, Pretoria, S.A.

LET us get Liberalism, the freedom policy, into perspective. We all want as much personal and political freedom as circumstances will allow. The policy, when it is true Liberalism, therefore has its legitimate place opposite Conservatism. But in wartime and when a country is threatened by communist subversion, we recognise that circumstances require drastic curtailments of liberty.

It is then not the right time to boost a policy of freedom from restriction in the name of Liberalism.

Each man's freedom is another's restriction to limit it. If there were no traffic laws, and we could park our cars like donkeys in the middle of the road, our freedom and security in driving would be reduced to a precarious degree. On a higher level, the notorious threat to liberty by Communism wherever it has established itself, becomes a circumstance as compelling as war, for restricting its freedom for subversive activity.

Surely it is common sense to distinguish Robinson Crusoe's due measure of freedom from that of South Africans who are threatened with subversion, sabotage, and revolution instigated by Communists from within and without the country! If the philosophy of Liberalism does not recognise the sliding rule of circumstance, it is sadly defective.

PET SHIBBOLETH OF LIBERALS

One of the Communist gambits is to create an explosive situation and then complain of "Fascist" methods of containing it. And the Liberals fall into line, gravely contending that Communist propaganda thrives on poverty and repression. This is the pet shibboleth of Liberals who are blind to the history and techniques of Communism as a militant force, and seem to suggest that it is a sort of charitable movement, albeit a godless one, as it pretends to be.

On that argument one would expect poverty and repression to win elections for it. But it has never won a free electoral contest and dares not try to do so.

In 1917 the Bolsheviks successfully "hijacked" the Kerensky revolution with machine guns, and then gained, not the acceptance of the poor oppressed Russian people, but their submission by terrorism. We once heard a NUSAS student from the Witwatersrand University actually say that the Communist revolution in China was due to a lack of bread! But China too was systematically subjugated, village by village, by

the ruthless terrorism of expert agents, each of them a careerist in violence.

MAJOR MISCONCEPTION

This parrot cry of the liberals that "Poverty breeds Communism", is one of the major misconceptions current about Communism. This is the false "stomach" theory of communism. Communism is not a disease caused by an empty stomach. It is a disease of the mind and soul.

Communism does not originate with the poor, the uneducated, the exploited, or the working class. Every major world Communist figure who became a Communist in a non-Communist country did so as a student intellectual, materialistic in philosophy and atheistic in faith. The long list of important communist agents who were well-fed student intellectuals includes Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Chou Enlai, Chou Teh, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi-minh, Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Klaus Fuchs, Julius Rosenberg, Guy Burgess, and Donald Maclean.

Furthermore, Communism is not sustained by the poor, the uneducated, the exploited, or the working class. It is sustained by the world's richest men. Indeed, it is a fully authenticated fact — carefully concealed by world press censorship — that the Russian Revolution was financed from Wall Street and that the Soviet Union has, ever since then, been built up and kept alive by International Finance; that the same paternal bonds have persisted through the years and were never stronger than they are today — and that their effective instruments are the United Nations and its specialised agencies, whence come the "winds of change" which are set to destroy the White man, his nations and civilisation.

So much, then, for the fallacy that poverty breeds Communism! A fallacy being endlessly parroted not only by our Liberals and our far-left English-language press — in their efforts to belittle and discredit the measures being taken against Communism and subversion by the South African Government — but also parroted by United and Progressive Party leaders.

Pink shades into red in politics as well as in fact. It is always Liberal idealism on which the Communists rely to open the door for their political robbery, on the pious pretext that all closed doors are a denial of freedom. In condemning so many measures of the Government, on principle, all those who do so are filling the role of fifth columnists to Communist infiltration.

UNTANGLE THIS WEB OF RED SUBVERSION

contd. from page 6

reader is invited to obtain more details about the S.C.M. from Maggi Whyte, at an address in Blackheath Rise, London S.E.13. This person is Mrs. Maggi Whyte, S.C.M.'s London Regional Secretary. She is the wife of the Rev. Bob Whyte, curate of the Church of the Ascension, Blackheath, South London. Rev. Whyte achieved major publicity two years ago when it was reported that he was a devout Mao-ist Communist and that he and his wife, Maggi, lived in a commune along with several other Mao-ists. At the time Rev. Whyte declared himself to be in favour of violent revolution. The Whytes have now moved from that address and live at 15c, St. John's Park, London S.E.3.

The main link between the Whytes, the S.C.M. and the National Council for Civil Liberties is Rev. Whyte's Parish Priest at the Church of the Ascension, Britain's leading Christian-Marxist the Rev. Paul Oestreicher. (For a partial exposé of Oestreicher's cosmopolitan background, and pro-communist sympathies and activities see: 'Exposed: The Red Reverend of Blackheath' in *Spearhead* October 1971). This Red Reverend is a prominent member of the Executive of the National Council for Civil Liberties (NCCL), whose Chairman is Mrs. Anne Berger, the mother of the student revolutionary Vivian Berger, who was closely associated with the production of the obscene pro-drug pro-Communist hippy magazine *OZ*.

Vivian Berger is prominently involved with the Communist controlled Schools Action Union, and gives editorial assistance to an SAU newspaper which incites children to engage in "creative vandalism". Several of Rev. Oestreicher's fellow NCCL executives are card-carrying members of the Communist Party. He is also a member of the Executive of Amnesty International, an organisation which concerns itself with the plight of imprisoned Left Wing revolutionaries.

Rev. Oestreicher's principal interest, however, is the evolution of the Christian-Communist synthesis, and has written a number of books on the subject jointly with leading Communist Party theoreticians (see: *What Kind of Revolution?*, Panther Books). To this end he keeps in very close touch with leading figures in the State sponsored and approved East German Evangelical Church. Indeed, he is so much a *persona grata* with the Communist dictators of East Germany that their Secret Police allow him to visit controversial inmates of their political prisons without news of such visits being known to the British or world press.

Oestreicher has numerous other sinister involvements and associations which will be dealt with at great length and detail in a forthcoming issue. However, it is plain to see that he is ideological mentor of the S.C.M., and as such is one of the most pernicious influences at large in Britain today.

LIVING A LIE

AMONG the ranks of the Conservative Monday Club there are many good patriotic Englishmen, and I personally, know quite a number of these people. Of those whom I know, I would not doubt for one moment their love of this country, their pride in their British heritage or their willingness to preserve it. They are totally opposed to the idea of the Common Market, they are anti-immigration, and seem in no way to apologise for wishing to base their concept of 'British Nationality' on anything other than race.

How these good nationalists can possibly remain members of the internationalist-orientated Conservative Party completely baffles me.

If we examine some of the more 'senior' members and leading lights of the Monday Club, we see that their political concepts appear to be as liberal and international as the concepts of the liberal-minded leadership of the Tory Party proper. Mr. Geoffrey Rippon, very much a leading light of the Monday Club, seems to have been set up as the arch-enemy of British Nationalism and Ted Heath's front rank poodle, what with being chief Common Market negotiator and not forgetting his whistle-stop tour of East African states as a representative of the Government in the Uganda Asian fiasco. It has also been proved that it is easier to remove good Nationalists from the Monday Club than it is to remove the internationalist Mr. Rippon, who appears to be the number one immovable object.

Another of the leading lights of the Monday Club has busied himself by accommodating Uganda Asians, in an effort, no doubt, to set a good example for the lesser brethren to follow.

How curious it is that M.P.s in the Monday Club voted with the Government in their attempt to legally turn our kith and kin of the old white Commonwealth into aliens.

Many of the Monday Clubbers I know, idolise Enoch Powell, but their influence on the Tory Government is absolutely nil, and they have proved themselves to be absolutely powerless. They cannot even persuade the Government to give Powell a junior under-secretary's job, let alone a place in the Cabinet. The probability, then, that they could possibly have any effect on Tory policy whatever, especially in regard to immigration or the Common Market is less than nil.

On the other hand the Tory establishment must be absolutely delighted with this state of affairs. They have so many of their opponents actually supporting their party and even helping to perpetuate the false notion that there is something nationalistic in the ideals of modern Toryism. Some of the most bitter opponents of Tory policies are actually faithfully paying their dues and membership fees, supporting jumble sales, wine and cheese parties, coffee mornings and evenings, and barbeques, all in aid of party funds. Most of all the Tory leadership must jump for joy when they think of all their potential enemies queuing up at election time

to write their little crosses next to the Tory candidate's name on their ballot papers to help put the internationalists back in power.

For some strange and inexplicable reason the Tory Party still maintains an aura of respectability, even after the many disreputable sell-outs of our people in all parts of the globe. How can any Nationalist, therefore, maintain his self-respect and at the same time support the Tories? If anyone thinks he can, he is either in no sense a nationalist or he is living a lie and building his hopes on an illusion. My advice, then, to all those good people, and I truly mean good people, who still support the Tory Party in any way whatever, is, don't let the establishment make fools of you any more, be true to yourselves, withdraw all support, stop kidding yourselves, put your country first, and put all your efforts into supporting a party that does the same.

IVOR BENSON GIVES TALK

Spearhead readers were treated to a fascinating talk by Ivor Benson, the distinguished South African writer and broadcaster, at Conway Hall on December 11th.

Mr. Benson devoted a considerable part of his talk to describing the reality behind the many so-called 'freedom' movements in Africa and the African 'governments' that arose out of them. While the claim is that colonialism has ended, all that is happening is that one form of colonialism is being replaced by another. Instead of the benevolent colonial rule of white nations, there is colonial rule of a very much less benevolent kind by international big business, which moves in to comandeer and exploit the great mineral wealth of Africa — with no advantage at all to the natives.

Mr. Benson explained how big business and Communism, while appearing to be in conflict, worked hand in glove to take over Africa. Every anti-apartheid movement in and outside South Africa was found to be controlled, not by Africans, but by white Communists determined to exploit South African problems for their own ends.

Mr. Benson's talk was followed by a lively and interesting question time.

How To Obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF

RATES (12 issues):

British Isles: £1.50p

British Commonwealth: £1.50p unsealed
£1.80p sealed


Foreign: £1.50p unsealed; U.S.A. \$4.50 unsealed
£2.30p sealed

Discounts can be obtained
for bulk purchases as follows:—

20-49 copies: 30 per-cent
50-99 copies: 40 per-cent

100-249 copies: 50 per-cent
250 copies and over: 60 per-cent

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to:
50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CR0 2QF, Surrey


The Editor,
"Spearhead",
50 Parsons Road,
Croydon CR0 2AF.

Letters

SIR: Considerable comment has already been made on the manner in which, at a time of considerable housing shortage, high taxation, nearly a million unemployed, and great pressure on social services, the government suddenly finds a dozen or more former Army or R.A.F. camps in which to house several thousand Ugandan Asians, to whom we have no obligation, legal or otherwise, and when India had offered to take them all.

One side effect of this sordid affair has been to awaken a great many people in some of the more remote parts of the country adjacent to the "resettlement" camps, where hitherto no race problem has existed, to the treachery of the government and the race relations industry in general.

The largest of these resettlement centres, holding up to 2000 Asians at a time, is the former R.A.F. base at Stradishall, Suffolk, which, according to the Home Office, is to be turned into a prison some time during 1973. It was vacated by the R.A.F. in September 1970, and was not used for accommodation purposes between then and September 1972, when the first Ugandan Asians arrived. Shortly after the government announcement that Stradishall was to be used as a centre to house the Asians, furniture vans arrived on the scene, and local people saw beds, cabinets, tables and chairs, etc., of a quality they had never possessed in their lives being unloaded into the houses.

Meanwhile, the local press in nearby Bury St. Edmunds recently spotlighted the case of a married couple who had to live apart, with their respective parents, for nearly a year after their marriage before arriving at the top of the Housing List and obtaining a home of their own. (Incidentally, Bury St. Edmunds' first Ugandan Asian family has just moved into a Council house, not more than a couple of months after arriving in this country).

Many local people are disgusted at what is going on at the Stradishall camp. Conditions are filthy, and litter is everywhere. Local people are paid to clear up the mess the Asians make every day. Although large numbers of the Asians there were formerly

employed in Uganda as chefs, all their meals are cooked for them by local chefs. People are also employed to make their beds for them. However, to prevent them getting bored, Hockey matches are arranged when it is not too cold, and several televisions give a choice of programmes in some of the former mess-rooms.

"Religious ceremonies" are, of course, observed, and shortly after the first Asians arrived, a few hundred broomsticks were sent to the camp. What have broomsticks to do with religious ceremonies? You may well ask. The Asians have to celebrate the full moon (or something) by dancing about and waving sticks in the air. One of the former aircraft hangers was utilised for this particular purpose. A few weeks later, in early November, the Asian new year was celebrated with bonfires around the camp.

The "refugees" (it is handy for the leftist communications media to be able to call them by this word) also need a little pocket money, and so social security payments are made of up to £28.00 a week. In this way, one Asian is reported to have accumulated over £200.00 since arriving. For those who prefer to spend our money, a taxi-service is provided to ferry them to and from nearby Haverhill and Bury St. Edmunds (which latter town is also accessible by bus). So busy has the local Social Security office been in dealing with the claims of the Asians that, as a result of this, a local widow, who depends on social security to pay her rent, received no payments for three weeks.

If there is anyone who dislikes the idea

of venturing very far from the camp, there is always the public house the other side of the adjoining main road (A143), whose weekly turnover has risen from around £60 per week to over £600 in recent weeks. The former 30 m.p.h. speed limit which was in force when the R.A.F. still used the airfield, has been reimposed, and there have been distributed special leaflets explaining road drill printed in Urdu, Hindi, Swahili and various other Asian languages to try and minimise road accidents, as that stretch of the A143 is narrow and twisty. In spite of this, a couple of Asians have been run over, but this does not seem to have affected the birth-rate, as the reports from both Newmarket General Hospital and the camp itself testify.

In view of all this, is it any wonder that some of the local do-gooders have become disillusioned? They spent a lot of time making appeals for clothing and toys for the Asians, only to find that if a coat has so much as a button missing, it is firmly rejected. Top quality cast-offs only are acceptable.

My objective in describing some of the recent events connected with the bringing of the Ugandan Asians to our country is to let more British people know what is being done in their name and at their expense, and how the government's treatment of these people differs from their treatment of native Britons (especially those brave enough to vent their feelings on this issue in person to the immigration authorities at Heathrow Airport).

PHILIP E. GEGAN
Wixoe, Nr. Halstead, Essex

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Spearhead publishes the best letter to the press on National Front policy every month. Send your cutting to us not later than the 15th of the previous month. You could win a £1 Nationalist Books voucher. This month's winner (below) was published in the *TASS Journal* (A.E.U.).

SIR.—Mr. J. M. Bill's very concise letter on monetary reform seems to point to a flaw in the motivations of trade union leaders.

Mr. Bill says he cannot understand why TU leaders and politicians do not pursue the fight for a sane monetary system, but later explains this himself, by pointing out that most objections to monetary reform come from "those who are doing well out of the present system." Here, I suspect, we have it.

The existing system, let it be said, *inevitably* perpetuates the rising cost of living, so that wage earners can only keep pace with it by continually pressing for higher wages. When claims are not met, strikes occur, with resulting inconvenience or hardship to the strikers, as well as to many who are in no way involved

in the dispute.

It is a system tailor-made to serve the specific interests of the already immensely wealthy (but non-productive) international bankers and financiers. They become the real masters, sucking the financial resources of all nations within the system and thus attaining power to dictate their own political, economic, and military policies. The nations affected are thus reduced to a state of concealed bondage, as Britain is now.

Yet we hear hardly a dickybird from TU leaders (or any so-called socialists or communists) in condemnation of this parasitic system, ruled as it is by and for the very, very rich! Why this silence? Why, if not that modern socialism and all its ramifications have become political bed-mates to the Lords of Finance, while

utterly betraying the interests they claim to represent?

Why do they not press for a monetary system that would stabilise the cost of living?

Why, above all, are TU leaders (along with socialists in general) so bitterly hostile to the very party—the National Front (accused of being ultra right-wing)—which advertises its prime objective to break Britain free of bondage to the Lords of Finance? It certainly offers food for thought!

It is not (I hope) as though TU leaders' mysterious attitude could result from ignorance of a subject in which they ought to be specialists, so may I be permitted to invite explanations from these learned gentlemen?

R. D. MOLESWORTH.

Trouble shooting

Pot and kettle

At least one paper has briefly reported the fact that three students at York University have been expelled as a result of an incident in which it was alleged that they shouted anti-Jewish abuse outside the rooms of a Jewish student and daubed "racialist" slogans on property elsewhere in the University. The report I saw remarked that the three students belong to a "National Socialist Society" which is believed to be linked with Mr. Colin Jordan's British Movement.

Some might consider it inappropriate for me to make any comment on this affair, as it is well known (even before that recent BBC *Midweek* TV programme!) that when I was in my late teens ten years ago I too was briefly associated with Mr. Jordan and his National Socialist organisation. But regardless of any "pot calling the kettle black" accusations that might come my way, I feel obliged to make comment.

I do not know the full details of the York case — of what the three students exactly did to merit expulsion. Shouting personal abuse at another student, in an intimidating fashion, simply and solely on the grounds of his racial origin is a spiteful and quite pointless thing to do, and deserving of some form of punishment — or at the very least a personal apology. Wall daubing is an activity which no Authority will fail to punish if the culprits become known. An appropriate punishment would be to make the culprits clean up the mess they have made, or pay to have it cleaned up.

Certainly, persons at an educational institution who persist in intimidating other students (on any grounds, not just those of race) and/or who persist in daubing walls can expect to be expelled. They would only have themselves to blame. But so far as I know, the offences committed by the three York students had not been committed several times, or even twice, but only once. Surely, therefore, the decision to expel them was unreasonably harsh — perhaps even the product of hysteria?

At their trial the students explained their conduct in terms of boozy high spirits. Not much of an excuse, but one that is trotted out continuously by Leftist students to explain away everything from beating up Policemen to attacking hotel guests, and one that is invariably accepted by university dons keen to keep a quiet life at any price. Where Left Wing students have been expelled for really savage activity it is commonplace for riots and sit-ins to be mobilised by their comrades, which tactics invariably achieve a second or even a third chance for the

malefactors.

My suspicion is that the reason why the York three were treated with such uncharacteristic harshness was because certain elements within the Jewish Community over-reacted to news of an incident and found themselves quite unable to distinguish between the genocidal proclivities of S.S. men of yesteryear, and the gormless conduct of three typically idiotic undergraduates.

As a result these elements will have burned up the telephone lines to the York University Vice-Chancellor demanding savage penalties for the three students. While one can understand the feelings of Jewish people over such matters as this, it does not mean that their instinctive reactions are necessarily right or conducive to the best interests and reputation of British Jewry.

It is not appropriate, I feel, that these three silly young men should be made into martyrs. It is also not appropriate that a precedent should be set whereby it becomes known that if you are a Communist extremist at University you can get away with virtually all manner of violent conduct towards political opponents (e.g. the recent assaults on Mr. Patrick Wall, M.P.) but that if you even so much as shout racial epithets at a Jewish student you can expect to be expelled forthwith.

Surely one of the prime reasons why the Nazi creed was found to be offensive and ultimately lethal was because it made Jewish people separate, special and different.

It had to happen

A couple of months ago the BBC decided to dispense with the services of Mr. Godfrey Baseley, the man who had scripted the never-ending saga of *The Archers* on Radio 4 for donkey's years and to the complete satisfaction of the millions of fans of that programme. The reason given for this by the BBC was that Mr. Baseley was "too old".

The real reason for this change, however, manifested itself just before Christmas when the story of how "Ambridge folk" were preparing to spend the festive season pivoted around the fact that one of the major characters (Jack Woolley) had decided to invite a young Coloured Immigrant orphan to stay with his family. As scripts for this series are prepared about six weeks before they are broadcasted, it would appear that the decision to introduce race relations mumbo-jumbo was taken shortly after the new scriptwriter was employed.

The Archers has always been used as a

medium for certain types of Government propaganda, but in Mr. Baseley's day this was restricted to passing on information about new laws and regulations regarding agriculture and other country pursuits, suggestions for the best time to plant or harvest particular types of crops, innovations in farm machinery and so forth. With his retirement we can now expect liberal-left propaganda poison to permeate the whole show.

I predict that it is only a matter of time before Borchester (the big town near to Ambridge) receives an influx of Immigrants as a result of the Government's dispersal programme. I predict that a local Community Relations Council will be formed and that Dan Archer (already on Ambridge Parish Council) and his wife Doris (a big noise in the Women's Institute) will busy themselves with its affairs.

I predict that opposition to the introduction of Coloured aliens into the "everyday story of countryfolk" will only come from the most bad-tempered, elderly and illiterate farm labourers who will be made to approximate rustic versions of Alf Garnett. All the nice, respectable and worthy folk will ooze tolerance and affection towards Coloured Immigrants.

I predict that the general store in Ambridge recently vacated by Sid and Polly Perks in order to take up the tenancy of The Bull pub will be taken over by a lovable Mr. Chatterjee who will turn it into 'Ye Olde English Tandoori Chicken House'. I predict that the next village fete will be a roaring success as a result of the Community Relations people laying on a Jamaican steel band and a troop of Bengali dancers.

If you have any predictions like these, why don't you send them to the BBC Radio Studio in Birmingham? I am sure the new man would welcome assistance other than from Mr. Mark Bonham Carter and his team of race perversion mind-benders.

The Editor wishes to thank all those readers from whom he has received greeting cards at Xmas, both as Editor of *Spearhead* and Chairman of the National Front. Except in a very few cases, it is not his habit normally to send cards — as to do so to every well-wisher would involve an expenditure that he is sure readers would prefer to see devoted to the cause. It is hoped therefore that this little message will suffice as a token of appreciation.

UXBRIDGE: A GREAT STEP FORWARD FOR THE N.F.

The National Front won a great moral victory at Uxbridge. There is no doubt of that either in the minds of patriots or in the minds of political commentators in Fleet Street — who described the affair as "disturbing", "ominous", "sinister" and "a shocker".

John Clifton, the National Front candidate, won nearly 3,000 votes — 8.2 per cent of the poll — despite the fact that nearly half the electorate did not bother to vote, despite the fact that two splinter group candidates also stood and competed for the anti-Coloured Immigration vote (i.e. Mr. Dan Harmston, representing Sir Oswald Mosley's Union Movement and Miss Clare Macdonald, on behalf of her National Independence Party).

Had these two candidates — or Mr. Reg Simmerson, an independent anti-Common Market candidate — not stood, there is little doubt that the National Front would have collected most of their votes and would have easily been able to top the 12½ per cent of the poll necessary to save its deposit and, more important, beat the Liberal Party candidate into third place — at a time of "Liberal revival". These factors were not lost on the Press. One newspaper described the NF result as the most significant election result of the 'mini-General Election' after the Liberal triumph in Sutton and Cheam.

Full credit for the great achievement must of course go to John Clifton, but also to his campaign manager Mr. Gordon Brown whose drive and organising ability not only ensured that the campaign took place, but was prosecuted in a businesslike and vigorous fashion. Press relations work for the campaign was carried out by Mr. Martin Webster.

The campaign started with a bang when the NF held a massed march through Uxbridge High Street. Such a colourful spectacle and show of strength is quite unheard of in suburban Parliamentary by-elections, and as a result considerable publicity was won for the NF campaign. The photograph which we show with this report originally appeared on the front page of a local paper. It shows the candidate, the name of his party, and his main policy platform at a glance.

Having quickly established himself as the main Nationalist candidate in the election, the credibility of the NF candidate was further enhanced by the considerable publicity which followed on the decision of the



N.F. MARCHES THROUGH UXBRIDGE
Candidate John Clifton is in centre (slightly to rear) with rosette

nearby West Middlesex Branch of the Monday Club to support the NF campaign rather than that of the Conservative candidate.

Despite the initial burst of publicity, Mr. Harmston's campaign never got off the ground, as Union Movement could never rally more than 11 campaign workers, and even then only at weekends. His widely reported comments at a public meeting: "I don't know Uxbridge. I don't even know where it is. I don't know its people, and I don't know their problems" did not assist his chances. A local journalist quipped: "Mr. Harmston came to Uxbridge as 'Big Dan', but he'll leave as 'Desperate Dan'."

Miss Clare Macdonald's four-person campaign was unnoticed except at weekends. The local Press were rather annoyed as a result of Miss Macdonald informing them that she formed the N.I.P. "after leaving the Conservative Party", when in point of fact she had been for several years a senior official of the National Front. Miss Macdonald's quest for "respectability" impressed neither the local press nor the electorate.

On many nights there were often more

than 100 National Front members out working in the Constituency, and rarely less than 40. It was obvious early in the campaign that neither the Labour nor the Tory organisations were working at full strength. Many persons who regularly turned out to assist those parties in the past decided to stay at home.

So frantic did the Tories become that on the day before polling day a coach-load of Tory M.P.'s were sent to the Constituency to help with canvassing — a completely unprecedented act. On polling day itself, Tory Borough Councillors with cars were dragged in from all over London to help convey the faithful to the polling stations. In the last few days Labour's pathetic campaign finally fizzled out.

In addition to thanking all the NF members and supporters who worked so hard on behalf of his campaign, John Clifton also wishes to express his gratitude to all those members of the International Socialists movement, particularly the Brunel University Branch, for doing so much to aggravate the ordinary citizens of Uxbridge and keep the name of the National Front in the public eye.

Why we fought Uxbridge

Statement from NF Chairman

When the National Front decided to contest the Uxbridge by-election we received a number of letters protesting that we should have kept out and left the field to the other 'nationalist' candidates.

Some of these letters were obscene and hysterical, bearing no name or address and clearly demonstrating the deranged minds of their writers. Some, on the other hand, were reasonable and sincere, and it is to these that I reply.

Those who protested raised the usual plea for 'unity' and said what a pity it was that three or four candidates were standing on the same policies. While I would not accept that all the policies were by any means the same, I take the point. It would be nice to have unity. It is a pity that the vote was split. The argument is what we should do about it.

Since the National Front was brought into being in 1966 with the aim of merging together all genuine patriotic and nationalist forces in Britain, and since it has very largely achieved that aim and clearly represents the main thrust of the modern British nationalist movement, we feel justified in saying that the people who are the effective enemies of unity are those who persist in maintaining 'parties' outside the National Front while fighting for the same policies.

In fact one of the other nationalist 'parties' fighting Uxbridge was founded by a tiny group of discontents who tried unsuccessfully to split the National Front last Summer. Does anyone seriously maintain that the onus is on us to accommodate their wishes in the cause of 'unity'? They are to blame for split votes at Uxbridge and for any other splitting of support that may exist, not the NF.

And so long as these absurd little 'parties' carry on in existence, serving no purpose but the puffed up self-importance of their 'leaders', is the National Front to engage in a continual hopping, skipping and sidestepping operation trying to avoid fighting elections in which they happen to be taking part? If such a view were accepted, no purposeful political plan or strategy would be possible. With every election that cropped up, we would have to ask not only "is it a good election to fight?" but "would we be treading on the toes of one or other of these mini-parties by fighting it?"

Since as long as the conceit of these little groups maintains them in existence, and as long as well meaning people are foolish enough to provide them with money, it is reasonable to expect that one or other of them will pop up at most of the by-elections that occur during the next two years. Is the NF to withhold its candidature every time this happens? The very prospect would be ridiculous.

The people who have it in their power to do a service for the cause of unity and to avoid splitting of the nationalist vote are the heads of the little splinter-groups. By ending their pointless existence now, they can accomplish the necessary.

London local election successes

A considerable factor in promoting the campaign of John Clifton in the Uxbridge Parliamentary by-election, was the excellent result achieved by Mr. John Fairhurst, Organiser of the Hayes NF Group, in a by-election for the Frogmore Ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon two weeks before the Uxbridge poll.

Though Mr. Fairhurst announced his candidature relatively late, he fought a very vigorous campaign with the backing of the Hounslow and Kingston & Richmond

Branches. Mr. Fairhurst won more than 400 votes, achieving 18 per cent of the poll — the highest percentage yet achieved by an NF candidate in a London election. His percentage was three-quarters that of the Conservative candidate, who came second (Labour won) and who bellowed abuse at Mr. Fairhurst when the results were declared.

The Tories suffered an even greater humiliation at the hands of the NF on the same night on the other side of London — in a by-election for the Custom House & Silvertown ward of the London Borough of Newham. There NF candidate Miss Joan Hammond won more than 180 votes, or 14.5 per cent of the poll. The Tory candidate achieved only 25 votes. Miss Hammond came within a dozen votes of beating a Ratepayer candidate and thus coming second.

The National Front has plans to fight numerous wards in Borough Council elections all over the country this coming April.

SUZAN RAISES CASH FOR N.F.

Suzan M'Kenzie, the 13 year-old daughter of Mrs. M'Kenzie, one of the stalwarts of the National Front Manchester Branch, recently completed a swim to raise funds for the NF.

Suzan swam 72 lengths of a local baths for which she was sponsored at £1 per length by NF supporters. Suzan (pictured on right) deserves the



congratulations of all of us for this fine effort.

Sponsored swims, or sponsored runs or walks, are an excellent way of raising money — and publicity! — for the NF. If any branches have athletically inclined members in their ranks, how about giving this method a try?

Nationalists: If you are collectors of British stamps, we offer you the chance to win an 1840 Penny Black. Write for details and selection of GB approvals or ring for details. The Postal Stamp Club, 31 Milkwood Road, Herne Hill, London SE24 0HX. (Tel. 01-274 3105)

NF
puts
Britain
First

The National Front is Britain's fastest-growing party which says: "Put Britain and the British people first!". It is the true voice of the British people. Its main policies have been proved by one opinion poll after another to represent the views of the great majority of the British people. Find out more about the National Front by completing this form and sending it to: *The Secretary, National Front, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey. (Tel. 01-684 3730)*

Name

Address

.....
.....

The National Front needs money. It needs the funds to print leaflets, pamphlets and posters, to fight elections, to mount demonstrations, to organise the biggest patriotic movement in Britain.

So invest in your country's future. Send a donation to the National Front Fighting Fund today. It will be money well spent.

GILLIAN BLOWS FROTH OFF GUINNESS

MRS. GILLIAN GOOLD



One of the most startling features of the NF Uxbridge election campaign was the decision by West Middlesex Branch of the Monday Club to refrain from supporting the official Conservative Party candidate, plastic Identikit Tory Mr. Michael Shersby, and instead give support to the National Front candidate Mr. John Clifton.

Prime mover behind this decision was Mrs. Gillian Goold Secretary of the Club Branch. As soon as the Branch members had voted to support her decision, she resigned her secretaryship of the Branch, but refrained from resigning her membership of the Club. Half-heartedness? Not at all. "I want the Club Executive to have the trouble of kicking me out!" she declared.

The reason for Mrs. Goold's action was that the Conservative Government had broken all its pre-General Election promises to the electorate in regard to Coloured Immigration and the Common Market. "The Heath Government has opened the floodgates to a massive invasion of Asians from Uganda, and is dragging the British people into the Common Market against the clear wish of the majority of the electorate," she stated.

"The Tory candidate at Uxbridge is a typical Heathite nonentity. Longstanding Conservative Party workers all over the country are finally sick and tired of Conservative Government betrayals and that is why many of them are turning to the National Front. That is why I shall be campaigning for John Clifton in the Uxbridge election."

As good as her word, Mrs. Goold, along with her husband and many local Monday Club members were out night after night delivering leaflets, making loudspeaker tours, and knocking on doors telling the voters of Uxbridge why they should vote National Front. Mrs. Goold was quite happy to be filmed by the BBC *Midweek* team doing this work.

Massive national publicity followed Mrs. Goold's dynamic action, and won expressions of support from all over the

country. One lady ex-Councillor from Nottinghamshire came all the way down to London to join the NF, to congratulate Mrs. Goold, and to spend a day canvassing for John Clifton. Mr. Len Lambert, Chairman of the Club's biggest Branch (Essex) quite frankly told the press that he was quite sure that his members would support a National Front candidate in Essex if the Tory candidate was as dripping wet as Mr. Shersby.

TOTAL HYSTERIA

These developments caused total hysteria in the upper echelons of the Monday Club. Mr. Jonathan Guinness, merchant banker and Chairman of the Club National Executive, lost his head and instead of defusing the crisis by setting up an enquiry and making no comment until after the election was over, immediately summoned a meeting of his Executive at which a decision to disband the West Middlesex Branch and request Mrs. Goold to resign was taken and announced to the Press.

This had the effect of making the National Front campaign the central feature of the election. So beneficial were his juvenile and precipitate reactions to the NF campaign that some cynical Press correspondents wondered whether Mr. Guinness was not deliberately "playing stupid".

The errant Essex Branch of the Club also drew the attention of the Club Executive, which despatched a Mr. Devenald-Lewis to a Branch meeting in order to deliver ghastly warnings about the utter beastliness of the National Front: "... Why... Why...," he spluttered with rage to his largely unsympathetic pro-NF audience, "... the National Front are nothing but Socialists! They want a controlled economy!!! (Shock! Gasp! Horror!)

Mr. Devenald-Lewis was given a very rough ride during his speech, and afterwards he was asked a question about the menace of International Finance — which won applause. At first he pretended he didn't understand the question, then, when pressed, he refused to answer it. Because of the mood of the audience the meeting Chairman, Mr. Len Lambert, was obliged to propose that the Branch should invite a representative of the National Front to the Club's next meeting in order to participate in a debate. This suggestion was passed overwhelmingly.

All patriots will doubtless wish to extend congratulations to Mr. Frank Stockham on his decision to start a Monday Club Branch in Bristol. A former Chairman of Bristol NF Branch, Mr. Stockham presided over the 1971 NF Annual General Meeting.

read...

six principles of BRITISH NATIONALISM

by JOHN TYNDALL

15p (plus 3p postage)

from:— 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

edited by

A.K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.
5 Elmhurst Court, St. Peters Road,
Croydon, Surrey.

"The New Unhappy Lords"

An exposure of power politics
By A. K. CHESTERTON

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS is a must for the bookshelf of any student of modern politics. It represents the most lucid and startling of all commentaries on the methods of subversion being used to undermine Britain and European Civilisation.

Paper back edition £1.00

(obtainable from Nationalist Books)

NATIONALIST BOOK CENTRE

50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF,
Surrey

Send for our free catalogue now

SPEARHEAD FUND

As our readers were recently informed, *Spearhead* needs to raise £350 over and above income from sales to meet running expenses for the year 1973. We have appealed to readers to help us raise this amount with their own contributions. In the last month readers have responded to this appeal to the extent of £53.50. This leaves us with a target of £296.50 for the year. We will be most grateful for your help in raising this sum.